



PATENTS
CUSTOMER NO. 006980

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF)	EXAMINER: Abdul Manaf
Robert Michael Trotter)	
)	
APPLICATION SERIAL NO.)	GROUP ART UNIT: 3635
10/666,500)	
FILED: September 19, 2003)	
)	
TITLE: DRYING SYSTEM FOR)	ATTY. DOCKET NO.
STRUCTURAL WATERPROOFING)	TROT1

RESPONSE

Mail Stop RCE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313

Dear Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action mailed March 1, 2006, Applicant is submitting a Request for Continued Examination, accompanied by this response.

In the Final Office Action mailed March 1, 2006, the Examiner stated that claim 13 currently stands rejected pursuant to 35 USC § 112 and that claims 1 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) in view of Beck, US Patent No. 3,975,467. The dependent claims were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) in view of Beck and Mendola, US Patent No. 4,185,429.

This Final Office Action was Applicant's first response in view of the previously filed RCE. As this case has been prosecuted with three separate Examiners, to alleviate any confusion regarding the invention, an interview was held with Examiner Manaf with the assistance of the

Applicant, Mike Trotter. From this interview the uniqueness of Applicant's invention was discussed and the addition of limitations regarding the construction of the drying system in combination with the foundation of the structure was deemed to distinguish over the prior art of record. However, because the Examiner desired to conduct a new search in view of the proposed amended claims, no agreement to the allowability of the claims was made at the time. Applicant thanks Examiner Manaf for his time in conducting the interview and his appreciation of the invention in acknowledging that the prior art of record was overcome.

With this response, Applicant is submitting the "amended" claims as discussed during the interview.

The **Amendments to the Claims** begin on page 3.

The **Remarks** begin on page 7.